

**PENNINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 11, 2012**

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act was announced.

Board Members Present: Mary Anne Heino, Eileen Heinzl, Josh Levy (left 9:15 p.m.), William B. Meytrott, Thomas Ogren, Mayor's Designee, Katherine O'Neill, James Reilly, Winn Thompson, Keelan Evanini, Alternate #1, Vacant, Alternate #2. Absent: Mark Blackwell

Also Present: Carmela Roberts, Roberts Engineering Group, LLC; Edwin W. Schmierer, Mason, Griffin & Pierson, Board Attorney; Mary W. Mistretta, Planning Board Secretary
Absent: Cindy Coppola, Coppola & Coppola Associates, Borough Planner;
John Flemming, Zoning Officer.

PLANNING BOARD – REORGANIZATION

OATH OF OFFICE – Taking the oath of office:

Mary Anne Heino, Class IV	01-01-2012 – 12/31/2015
G. Winn Thompson, Class IV	01-01-2012 – 12-31-2015
Eileen Heinzl, Class III (Council Representative)	01-01-2012 – 12-31-2012
William Meytrott, Class II (Official of Municipality)	01-01-2012 – 12-31-2012
Thomas Ogren, Class I (Mayor's Designee)	01-01-2012 – 12-31-2012

Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Mr. Reilly to nominate Winn Thompson Chairman and the Board unanimously agreed by voice vote. Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson to nominate James Reilly Vice Chairman and the Board unanimously agreed by voice vote.

Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Mr. Reilly, to appoint the following professionals and the Board unanimously agreed by voice vote:

Edwin W. Schmierer, Mason Griffin Pierson – Board Attorney
Cindy Coppola, Coppola & Coppola Associates, Board Planner
Carmela Roberts, Roberts Engineering, LLC – Board Engineer

Mr. Thompson stated that the members of the Application Review Committee have been Ms. Donlon, Mr. Reilly and Ms. O'Neill. Ms. Donlon did not wish to be reappointed to the Board and a replacement was needed on the committee. It was agreed that Mr. Ogren would replace Ms. Donlon.

Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Mr. Meytrott to approve the following and the Board unanimously agreed:

Mary W. Mistretta was appointed Planning Board Secretary.

The Hopewell Valley News was designated the official weekly newspaper for the Planning Board and **The Times of Trenton** designated the official daily newspaper to be used only when through no fault of the applicant or the Board it was not possible to publish Legal Notice in the official newspaper.

Planning Board meeting dates, on the 2nd Wednesday of the month at 7:30 p.m., were approved: February 8, March 14, April 11, May 9, June 13, July 11, August 8, September 12, October 10, November 14, December 12, January 9, 2013 (Reorganization and Regular)

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC ADDRESS – Mr. Thompson asked if there was anything that the public would like to address that was not on the agenda. There being no comments, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

WAIVER OF SITE PLAN

Dino Spadaccini, Esq. stated that he was there on behalf of the applicant, Old Mill Square, and he gave a brief history of the project. Mr. Spadaccini stated that the only report they had was a memorandum from Roberts Engineering, dated January 6, 2012. Mr. Spadaccini explained that TD Bank (previously known as Commerce Bank) received Site Plan approval around July 5, 2000 and ever since the bank was constructed Old Mill Square has been having stormwater runoff problems from the bank property. There is a wide driveway between the two properties and the runoff from the driveway was supposed to flow into the existing detention basin, but it does not work and it has been a constant problem for the Old Mill property. He stated that they have been trying to work on the problem with TD Bank and they also approached the Borough, but Mr. Wittkop indicated that the Borough does not get involved with drainage issues and declined to assist with the situation. He stated that they have come to an agreement with TD Bank to correct the problem which is the plan that was distributed to the Board. He stated that there have been a few changes to the plan. He stated that this agreement had been discussed before the damage from a recent storm (storm in August) which has caused them to reconstruct the building. Mr. Russell M. Smith was sworn in and described the proposal on the plan which consists of a French drain which will extend across the open driveway and will intercept the water and would be carried in a 12 inch pipe along the property line and back across the property line into the TD Bank detention basin. The TD Bank engineer updated his analysis to show that the basin does have the capacity to handle the additional water. When the TD Bank site was originally approved the detention basin was oversized to accommodate areas where stormwater problems existed. Mr. Smith stated that this was a perfect use for the basin as the Old Mill property is having problems. The water currently runs down along the back of the building and onto the Borough property and eventually into the creek.

Mr. Smith stated that there were three comments that he wished to address in the Roberts Engineering memorandum. The first comment is on page 3, Site Plan Comments, number 2. He agreed with the engineer and confirms that they are disturbing less than 5,000 square feet of land, approximately 2,000 square feet is being disturbed. Number 3, the tree protection plan was for a line of Arborvitae trees that is no longer there and, therefore, the tree protection is no longer necessary. The final comment is regarding number 10, Mr. Smith stated that they would like to nail this down when the resolution is written. They will only do test pits in grass areas and they are proposing to do three test pits along the existing water main to verify its location. The Bohler plan addresses test pits, but does not state how many. He stated that they are proposing to do two in the back and one in the front in the grass

areas and would be able to determine the approximate depth and its horizontal location. Mr. Spadaccini stated that during negotiations with TD Bank, they were adamant about not disturbing their paved lot. The other part of number 10 deals with the location of the proposed storm drainage line in relation to the water line. Mr. Smith stated that they have discussed this with the Borough Engineer. The plan currently shows 5 feet between the two pipes and he feels confident that 5 feet is sufficient and will allow for access to either pipe without disturbing the other. It will also keep the pipes far enough away from the building to keep it safe, as they do not want heavy equipment close to the building. Mr. Spadaccini stated that it was their understanding that 5 feet would be sufficient after ongoing discussions with the engineer's office and are somewhat confused in light of the fact that all the references to the easements are about a 10 foot on center easement and they were assuming that it was still acceptable until they came across this paragraph in Ms. Roberts' memorandum. He stated that the other issue he had with this paragraph was in regards to the statement that the relocation of the water line was subject to the Department of Public Works Superintendent's approval. He stated that no one is contemplating moving the water line. Ms. Roberts stated that they may not, but the plans indicate that if they find a conflict between the discharge pipe and the water line that it will have to be rerouted. Ms. Carmela Roberts, Borough Engineer, was sworn in. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he would prefer to work with the Borough Engineer's office and not the Public Works Office. Ms. Roberts stated that she could be their point of contact, but the Department of Public Works would have to be included since there is a water main involved and a Licensed Water Operator will have to be involved.

Mr. Smith stated that the last issue was in regards to the Performance Guarantee which he did not feel was necessary, but they have no problem with the engineering inspection fees. They are also requesting permission to proceed immediately on the work while the weather holds out. Mr. Smith stated that they would like permission to start right away as filing the easements will take time. Mr. Smith explained that the roof leaders will go towards the rear of the building and tie into the drainage plan. Mr. Smith stated that there were two stormwater inlets by the base of their driveway, but the pipes are not large enough to handle additional runoff and this plan will help reduce some of the runoff to those inlets. Mr. Thompson reaffirmed that regardless of the property line or anything else, everything will be kept 5 feet from the water line and Mr. Smith confirmed this. Mr. Smith stated that TD Bank and Old Mill will agree to the maintenance of the detention basin and drainage system.

Mr. Thompson questioned why the applicant was before the Board since there were no physical changes being proposed. Mr. Schmierer stated that since easements would be required and because of the need of other conditions, it was felt that there should be some control by Borough officials. Ms. Roberts stated that it was also an amendment to a site plan that was approved several years ago for Commerce Bank (now known as TD Bank). She stated that a water main easement that should have been provided was never given to the Borough. The applicant (Dino Spadaccini, Old Mill Square) went to Borough Council and Council did not feel that they had jurisdiction to grant the approval that was being requested.

Mr. Schmierer stated that he had a draft resolution which included Ms. Roberts' report and he stated that if the Engineer was satisfied with the conditions and the Board was inclined they could vote on the resolution to enable the applicant to begin work while there is still good weather. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he is requesting that the current water main easement that runs along the rear of his property be vacated when the new easement is filed.

Mr. Thompson asked Ms. Roberts if she had any further comments for the Board. Ms. Roberts stated that she wanted to confirm the applicant's explanation regarding the Soil Conservation and the note for tree protection on the plan. Ms. Roberts stated that she agrees with the applicant that three test pits are sufficient to determine where the pipe line is located. She stated that she had spoken with the Superintendent of Public Works, Jeff Wittkop, subsequent to her memorandum and Mr. Wittkop is satisfied with the 5 foot separation between the water main and the new storm pipe. He has, however, requested that the water main easement be 20 feet wide rather than 10 feet wide. If it was necessary to work on the pipe it would be near impossible to stay within a 10 foot easement. The 20 feet would allow enough space without having to get permission from the Bank or Mr. Spadaccini to work on the water pipe. Ms. Roberts stated that she did not object to the applicant's request to waiver the performance guarantee, as all of the improvements are on private property and there is no disadvantage to the Borough if they do not get installed.

Ms. Roberts asked how the Borough could be assured that the water main easement would be filed. She stated that the water main easement should have been filed 10 years ago and she feels that some kind of trigger should be placed in the approval to ensure that this is filed. Mr. Ogren asked what the width was of the original easement and neither Ms. Roberts nor Mr. Spadaccini could recall. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he would not agree to a 20 foot easement. He stated that he has a frail older building and has just replaced three of the basement walls. He stated that before TD Bank was built he had a dry basement and he does not want equipment close to his building which may disturb the foundation. Mr. Russell Smith agreed and stated that they would not want a piece of equipment closer than 10 feet to the building. Mr. Smith was asked what distance a 10 foot easement would be from the building. The current easement is 5 feet and extends beyond the pipe, the current easement is 5 feet centered on the pipe would be within approximately 12 feet of the building. If it was pushed out another 5 feet to provide a 20 foot easement it will be too close to the building. Mr. Spadaccini felt that anyone working on the pipe would work from the TD Bank's side of the pipe. Mr. Smith stated that NJ American Water Company requires an exclusive easement on their water mains with 5 feet on each side and that is consistent with what was proposed by the Borough Engineer, but not consistent with Mr. Wittkop's suggestion. Ms. Roberts stated that if work needed to be done on the water main, there would be a certain amount of work that would have to be done on Mr. Spadaccini's property. She pointed out that there is currently a 15 ft. wide water line easement on the Spadaccini property and it runs from the property line to the rear wall of the building. She stated that he would like to vacate the entire existing easement and then provide just a small amount for a new easement of 10 feet, but it is not enough for the people in the field doing the work. In the end there will not be a 15 foot easement that goes up to the foundation wall, there will be about 7 feet on the property and the easement will be reduced by half. Mr. Spadaccini explained that he went to Mr. Wittkop about the drainage problem and was told that the Borough does not get involved in drainage issues and now Mr. Wittkop has gotten involved and decided that the Borough did need to get involved. Mr. Spadaccini feels that if the American Water Company only requires 10 feet, he does not understand why Mr. Wittkop needs 20 feet. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he is just concerned about the welfare of his building. Mr. Thompson asked who the water line served as it looks like it ends. Ms. Roberts stated that it ends on the TD Bank property. The pipe line only got built as far as the fire service. There was discussion about other municipalities that have 10 foot easements where there is no other choice, but Ms. Roberts stated that over the years there has been a trend toward smaller easements because they are easier to obtain, but it is near impossible in a 10 foot area to bring in needed equipment without being on private property and she does not feel that the request is out of line. Mr. Smith stated that the biggest problem was that they did not want

any equipment closer than the easement line, as it is proposed on the plan because it could damage the building, that's the bottom line and we are not going to give an easement that is any closer to the building. Mr. Spadaccini stated that it was not his fault that TD Bank did not get an easement for the water line and it is now his problem and he is forced to go before the Board instead of being able to deal with it administratively. He noted that TD Bank was not at the meeting because they did not want to spend any more money.

Mr. Ogren asked if there was any way they could determine the original width of the easement that was approved in 2000 and the Board could agree to the same width. Ms. Roberts suggested that the applicant, herself and Mr. Wittkop have a meeting outside the Planning Board and come to a determination regarding the width. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he could tell her that it would be 5 feet. He stated that if it gets any closer to his building it will start to compromise the general health, safety and welfare. Mr. Smith suggested that Mr. Wittkop talk with TD Bank tomorrow. He can get 10 feet now and he can talk to TD Bank about getting the other 10 feet and that will give him 20 feet entirely on TD's property where it is safe to put a piece of equipment. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he would be glad to set up a meeting with TD Bank for Mr. Wittkop and Ms. Roberts to discuss the easement, but stated he is not willing to give up more than 5 feet. In response to Mr. Ogren's question, Ms. Mistretta stated that the easement should have been on the original approved plan for Commerce Bank, but since an easement was never filed and the engineer at that time signed off on the project, she was not sure if it was shown on the plan. Mr. Smith agreed and he was pretty sure that it was not shown on the plan. Mr. Schmierer thought Ms. Roberts' suggestion was good, the Board could agree on the easement on Mr. Spadaccini's property to say not more than 5 feet off center line into the applicant's property, provided, however, that the applicant will cooperate with the Borough officials and talk to the adjacent property owner, TD Bank, to see if the easement could be enlarged to 20 feet, 15 feet on their property. Ms. Heinzl asked if TD Bank has agreed to everything that was being presented on the plan and Mr. Spadaccini stated that they were in agreement and they have done everything with TD's engineer. Mr. Smith stated that the plan currently shows the 10 ft. easement as suggested by Ms. Roberts and it is centered on the pipe, 5 ft. on each side of the pipe. Mr. Thompson felt that the suggestion of meeting with TD Bank about a 20 foot easement was a good idea. Mr. Schmierer stated that TD Bank could be informed that the Board feels strongly that they agree to the easement and this could be a condition of approval.

Ms. Roberts stated that there was one additional suggestion from Mr. Wittkop that Mr. Spadaccini replace the water line from his building. Mr. Spadaccini stated that they just recently replaced the water line from their building and it was completed and inspected.

Mr. Thompson asked if there was anyone in the public with any comments or questions, there being none the public portion of the hearing was closed. Mr. Schmierer reviewed points that were in the resolution and stated that Ms. Roberts' memorandum of January 6, 2012 will be attached to the resolution and the conditions will be included. Language would be added that the easement will be as shown on the plan, not greater than 5 feet on the applicant's property provided, however, that the applicant will cooperate with the Borough officials to approach TD Bank to see if the Borough can obtain a 20 ft. wide easement, 15 ft. on TD and 5 feet on Mr. Spadaccini's property.

Ms. Heino had questions concerning the vacating of the existing water line easement and the possibility of being left with only a 5 foot easement. Ms. Roberts stated that presently there is a 15 foot water line easement on Mr. Spadaccini's property and only Borough

Council can vacate the easement. The easement will remain in effect until the new easement is filed and for a short time there will be two easements on the property. Mr. Smith stated that they were thinking of vacating the existing easement and filing the new easement at the same time. Mr. Schmierer stated that we are protected with the existing easement. Ms. Heino also questioned whether we were requiring the applicants to do the work on the plan. Mr. Schmierer stated that we are not requiring them to do anything, but we are responding to their request. Mr. Reilly asked who else was served by the water line. Ms. Roberts stated that she was only certain that TD Bank used it. Mr. Smith felt that the Exxon station was not served by the pipe as they were there earlier. Mr. Reilly had concern regarding access to the water line if it was needed before the easements were filed. Mr. Smith stated that if it is the Borough's water line it is his understanding that they could access it. Mr. Evanini asked why a 10 or 20 foot easement was being discussed and were they standard numbers. Mr. Schmierer explained that the standard in the industry was a 20 foot wide on center easement if there was room for it because it provides 10 feet on either side to work. In more urban settings there is not always enough room and you can only get a 10 foot easement. In this case there is an unusual circumstance.

The Board felt that the trigger to make sure the water easement is filed is that the 15 foot easement will remain until the new easement is filed. Ms. Roberts stated that the existing easement is on Mr. Spadaccini's property and there would be no legal means to make sure TD Bank files the easement for the water main. Mr. Schmierer felt that TD Bank should be informed of the proceedings tonight and the Board and the Public Works Department Supervisor strongly feel that there should be a 20 foot wide easement, 15 and 5. If they do not agree to this, the Board could remind them that a summons could be issued for being in violation of site plan approval and they would have to come to the Board to explain this.

Mr. Thompson asked for a motion from the Board. Mr. Ogren made a motion and Mr. Levy seconded the motion to approve the waiver of site plan approval with conditions. Roberts Engineering memorandum of January 6, 2012 will be attached as Exhibit A-1, no performance bond required, 5 feet on each side, work on 15 feet. The Board will also be voting on the resolution so that work may proceed when the signed copy of the resolution is received. Voting yes: Heino, Heinzl, Levy, O'Neill, Meytrott, Ogren, Reilly, Thompson, Evanini. Absent: Blackwell. The hearing ended at 8:45 p.m.

APPLICATIONS

Kevin & Donna Doran, Block 401, Lot 2, 4 Fitzcharles Drive, R-100 Zone. Mr. Schmierer announced that proof of notice and proof of publication were in order and the Board could take jurisdiction. Mr. Kevin Doran was sworn in by Mr. Schmierer. Mr. Doran distributed a rendering of the proposed deck. Mr. Doran explained that they would like to add a deck and it would be the first addition that has been done to the original house. He stated that when they purchased the property it was already at 25.5% coverage and the maximum is 25%. The proposed deck is 40 ft. wide and 12 ft. deep and would raise the coverage to 27.6%. The applicant is requesting a variance for 2.1% coverage above the maximum. Mr. Doran stated that it is a one-story deck and there will be slots on the floor to allow seepage of water. He stated that at the time there are two solid concrete steps in front of the doors that will be removed and will offset some of the additional coverage. Mr. Doran stated that the deck would be built in an existing recession of the house. The area is flat and the deck would not go beyond the water runoff area. He stated that in 12 years, including the most recent torrential rains in the last year they have had no issues with water displacement and

runoff. He stated that they are planning at minimum a rain barrel and possibly some additional protection so that the water is retained.

Mr. Reilly stated that the applicant is requesting three waivers. A, B and J and the Application Review Committee has recommended that the Board approve them. He stated that the Committee will be recommending further changes to the checklist and a few of those are the waivers requested by the applicant. The Committee does not feel that any of the requested waivers would impair the Board's ability to judge the application and ARC recommends that the Board approve the waivers. Mr. Reilly stated that the survey was not recent, but the applicant could testify that the survey is still valid and that nothing has changed. Mr. Thompson and Ms. Heino had questions regarding the existing slate path and Mr. Doran responded that the slate path under the deck would be removed and replaced with gravel and the rest of the path would remain. Ms. O'Neill asked Mr. Doran if he considered stopping the deck at the garage to reduce the coverage and Mr. Doran stated that they looked at a lot of designs, but they wanted to connect the two doorways and improve the safety of the exits. Mr. Doran stated that they limited the depth which only extends approximately one foot from the house. Mr. Doran stated that the deck will be built with natural wood and will have spaces between the decking that will allow water seepage. Ms. Heino asked if the bottom of the deck will be solid wood as shown in the rendering. Mr. Doran stated that there will be framing with some type of lattice to prevent animals from getting under the deck and shrubbery will be planted in front of the deck. Mr. Reilly asked where the water in the rear of the house drains and does it drain on the neighbors' property. Mr. Doran stated that there were no water issues on the property and stated that there is a natural slope on the property and the water flows down to the cul-de-sac. He stated that there has never been any pooling of water since they have lived there.

Mr. Thompson asked if there were any comments or questions from the public, there being none the public portion of the meeting was closed. Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Mr. Levy to approve the application. Voting yes: Heino, Heinzl, Levy, O'Neill, Meytrott, Ogren, Reilly, Thompson, Evanini. Absent: Blackwell. The hearing ended at 9:00 p.m.

ZONING OFFICER'S REPORT

Mr. Flemming was not present at the meeting, but Mr. Ogren stated that he had an issue that he had previously discussed with the Zoning Officer. He distributed pictures of the rear view of the Village Salon at the corner of S. Main Street and Delaware Avenue. Mr. Ogren stated that the owner has talked to him about enclosing the loading dock area in the rear of the building and he had discussed with John Flemming whether site plan approval was required. Mr. Ogren stated that he had also discussed this with a few Board members and it was their feeling that it would not require site plan approval since there is no expansion of the foot print of the building and it is covered by an existing roof. Mr. Schmierer agreed stating that it was a reasonable interpretation. Mr. Ogren stated that the enclosure would not expand beyond the loading dock. Ms. Heino had concerns about safety if the rear door was removed. Mr. Ogren stated that the plans will be reviewed by the Construction Official and would have to meet any building code requirements. Mr. David Clarke, owner of the building, was in the audience and stated that they now use the entire building and have more than enough exits, but he would keep an exit in the rear. Mr. Reilly stated that an addition needs site plan approval, but since this is not an addition he would agree that it does not need site plan approval. There was further discussion and the Board agreed that it would not need site plan approval and it will be a visual improvement to that area.

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION

Mr. Ogren stated that he did not have an issue with the references that the Olivieri fence was grandfathered, but he questioned when something is demolished and replaced is it still considered grandfathered. In looking at case law he thought that anything new was not grandfathered whether destroyed by accident or design. Mr. Schmierer stated that if you leave up a percentage, usually 25%, you can rebuild to what was there before. If something is 100% destroyed the grandfather protection no longer exists. Mr. Schmierer stated that a fence could not be replaced leaving 25% to be replaced a year or so later, the 25% would have to remain to keep it grandfathered. This would also apply to fences that have variances, if the fence is being totally replaced another variance is required. A property owner cannot replace 75% of the fence and 25% a year later, the original 25% of the fence must remain.

Joseph D. & Carol L. Olivieri – Block 104, Lot 1, 1 East Franklin Avenue, R-80 Zone, Variance Application P11-008.

Ms. Heino made a motion, seconded by Mr. Meytrott, to adopt the resolution. Voting yes: Heinzl, Meytrott, Thompson, Evanini, Heino, Not voting: Levy, O'Neill, Reilly. Not voting: Ogren. Absent: Blackwell. Mr. Levy left the meeting.

WORK SESSION

Affordable Housing - Mr. Schmierer gave a brief update regarding Affordable Housing. He stated that Ms. Coppola and the other planners are sending out an alert regarding municipalities' affordable housing fees. The current State administration has been announcing that unless municipalities have concrete affordable housing plans to spend their affordable housing trust funds by July 1, 2012, the State might start collecting the accounts and put them in a large affordable housing account to be distributed. Pennington's Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan has been submitted to the former COAH and probably has been passed along to the Planning Division in the Department of Community Affairs. They have not done anything with the documents as they do not know how to identify the new future obligations until the Supreme Court makes a decision. Mr. Schmierer stated that the Borough is in a difficult position and might risk losing the money if they do not have a viable plan by July. He stated that the planners are suggesting that plans be reviewed and possibly updated to find if there are more viable ways to spend the money for affordable housing. Mr. Schmierer stated that part of the Borough's plan was to provide accessory apartments and he has found that there does not seem be interest in any of the municipalities in accessory apartments and he suggested that the Borough might want to review that part of the plan and see if there are other options to allocate that money.

Mr. Ogren asked if our Spending Plan was approved and Mr. Schmierer responded that it was not, but it could be approved by a letter as of January 20, 2012. It allows a municipality to amend a spending plan by having the governing body adopt a resolution and having the attorney or the planner send a letter with the new plan. Mr. Thompson suggested that the most cost effective thing to do would be to write a letter requesting that they review our existing plans rather than spending more money. There was discussion about other possible uses that would be more viable than the accessory apartments. Mr. Ogren suggested that a sub committee be formed to come up with realistic ideas. Ms. Heinzl asked how another approach would get any more attention than our proposed spending plan that has been sitting there unanswered. Mr. Schmierer stated that if there was a tweak

to the plan a representative from the Borough could make an appointment with DCA to discuss the change and whether it is a viable plan that might at least help defer the State from taking the trust fund. Ms. Heinzl and Mr. Ogren will follow-up to see what steps should be taken.

Waiver Procedure - Mr. Reilly reported that ARC met regarding the Board's suggestions for the waiver procedures and a revised copy had been distributed to the Board. If the document is satisfactory to the Board they can work with it and revisions can be made if they find it necessary. Mr. Evanini suggested that the applicant should also be advised in writing if the information submitted is insufficient and it should be added to number 4.

MINUTES – November 9, 2011 – Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Mr. Meytrott to approve the minutes and the minutes were approved by voice vote.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary W. Mistretta
Planning Board Secretary